

**Parsonsfield Planning Board Meeting
Tuesday, December 19, 2017
Minutes (Draft)**

Planning Board Members in Attendance:

Carl Nance, chair
JP Espinosa
William Ryan
Nate Stacey
Richard Sullivan

CEO David Bower in Attendance

Also in attendance:

Donald Winslow, Carolyn A. Chute, Michael A. Chute, Tom Greer, Stephen Anderson, Mark Fisher, Corey Lane, Gerard Clifford, S. Tiffany Brendt, Jesse Stacey, Jeff Wright

(Note: These minutes are taken off a recording)

Chairman Nance called the meeting to order at 7:02.

November Minutes Reviewed and Approved

The board reviewed the minutes from the November 21, 2017 meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Site Plan Review: Mark Fisher, 450 North Road, Map R-5, Lot 30

Application for Composting Operation

Discussion

Chairman Nance: apologized to Mr. Fisher for not sending him a letter. Having missed the last Planning Board meeting, Chairman Nance asked for updates. The board has received a lot of information from Mr. Fisher and Mr. Stacey sent an email on the issue.

Mr. Sullivan: Description of different categories of compost:

- Type IA - leaf vegetation with ratio of carbon to nitrogen greater than 25:1
- Type IB - other residuals between 25 and 15:1
- IC - fish and other residuals.
- Type 2 – sewer, sludge, septic and other human pathogens
- Type 3 metals and other stuff.

Mr. Sullivan recommends saying no on types 2 and 3. He asked Mr. Fisher to confirm that he wasn't planning on process types 2 and 3 anyway, but he wants to assure the people of the town, and also if down the road he may change his mind. That's just something to have in there.

Mr. Fisher: That's correct. People might be concerned, and he agrees to the condition.

Mr. Stacey: Regarding Type IC, the regulation limits 5 cubic yards in 30 days without a permit. His thought is to keep it at a peak of 5 cubic yards, regardless of state permit.

Mr. Fisher: his reply is that food waste can actually be worse than fish.

Mr. Stacey: It looks like IC is a gray area. There are some materials that show up under both IC and IB.

Mr. Espinosa: He's allowed to process whatever he wants if it's agricultural – when it comes to commercial, that's when the fine line is crossed. If we vote for approval with acknowledgement that he can do what he wants in the agricultural side within state guidelines, but as he goes into commercial permitting, then he has to come back before the board.

Mr. Stacey: State would allow larger quantity of IC under commercial. He thinks 2 and 3 should be off the table. Do we want to condition that residual or not?

Mr. Espinosa: conditional approval allowed, and come back for a review when production exceeds 4000 cubic yards. And waive the application fee. Mr. Espinosa asked what the fee is.

Mr. Bower: Fee is \$150 in escrow and 25 application fee

Mr. Espinosa: Okay let's take that off the table. I think since there is such a gray area concerning IC, we're going to have to trust him. Say no to 2 and 3. Follow the state guidelines. Can't stop him his it's agricultural. Seaweed, grass clippings are included in IC and also in IB.

Mr. Fisher: Regarding grass clippings, he can't compost a whole lot, which is why he was thinking about going for the commercial permit. It depends on how wet the grass clippings are. Also, there are some fish products that are low odor even though they are IC. The defining criteria in his mind should be what is going to cause a lot of odor. The other things can be managed properly. He is working on an odor management plan. For instance, if you get a load of food waste which is smelly, cover with wood chips right away. Grass clippings are relatively easy to compost, but his concern is with pesticides. He doesn't know right now - he'd rather keep it big, because he doesn't know what's going to be out there.

Mr. Espinosa: He would just say no to 2 and 3

Mr. Stacey: If an odor issue arises, is there something we can do?

Mr. Espinosa: It would be next to impossible to enforce the smell issue. We'd have to hire an olfactory specialist. It would be something the taxpayers in the community couldn't handle.

Mr. Sullivan: If the whole neighborhood smelled like fish, it would probably generate complaints and you would do something about it, right? If the seminary is having an event and they complain about fish smells, you could do something about that?

Mr. Fisher: Yes, absolutely I would do something about that. Permit specifically says it may not produce nuisance odors. That's a little hard to define, but the guidelines that you have to have in place are designed to consider this. Composters acknowledge there are some things that are hard to control. One would be if there is a lot of rain. Covers help with that a lot. But most of the time, there shouldn't be an issue.

Vote:

Mr. Stacey: Motioned to vote, seconded by Chairman Nance.

Approval with the following conditions: No types 2 or 3. Mr. Fisher will come back to the planning board when production exceeds 4000 cubic yards

The board voted unanimously to approve.

Mr. Espinosa: Asked Mr. Fisher to come back to the board if he plans on processing types 2 and 3. It's something they would consider.

Mr. Fisher: His goal is to be organic. Things can change, but for what his present goals are right now, he wouldn't use sewage sludge anyway.

Mr. Espinosa: He just wants him to know that the board is open to changes in the future

Chairman Nance: He'll go to David for, permitting, is that correct?

Mr. Bower: Well, you're going to have to generate a letter to Mr. Fisher and minutes will have to reflect the vote. Then he can issue any permit that is required. But what he's doing, there is no permit required. At this point, you don't need anything else.

Application for Subdivision: Watson Woods, Map R-8, Lot 37

Revised proposal on corner of Route 160 and Hussey Road

(Note: At this point in the meeting, the dialogue is difficult to make out due to so much talking in the audience.)

Chairman Nance had sent Mr. Wadsworth an email with the conditions that we talked about.

Mr. Greer: Suggests going through the list to make sure that he understands them correctly.

Site distance of driveways – should be provided by a survey group. We can do that. That's not an issue.

Because the driveways have become so sensitive, we would put a stake out there with a condition saying the driveway has to be at this location, unless approved by Code Enforcement for a different location. The building permit would include that information. If it's in a different location, he would assume it would require another site distance analysis where the road commissioner would come out to say that's okay. That's a starting point to say that there is some town control over where the driveway is going. Does that seem reasonable?

Mr. Ryan: We just need to come out of this knowing that we have each driveway with a proper site distance.

Chairman Nance: Which means we would need a letter from a surveyor.

Mr. Greer: When selling the lots, the builder may want to move the driveway from location to another? As long as it meets the standards of site distance, that should be acceptable to the town.

Mr. Bower: Actually, the road commissioner.

Mr. Greer: Our duty to you is to show that each lot has a location that has adequate site distance, correct? Then we're following it up with, wherever ends up is in an adequate location.

Mr. Espinosa: Our concern is whether or not the driveway location stays the same, each lot meets the conditions.

Mr. Greer: I think we're good with that.

Graded Lots Over 20%

Mr. Greer displayed a graphic that shows grades

Mr. Greer: There are little bits and pieces that are over 20%. The question is: which ones do you want grading plans on if there's adequate room someplace else? The orange is 15-20% slopes. Along Hussey Road, there are a few places where they are in the 15-20% range, but in the front there's a place to put them that's not in that range. None of the lots are all over 20%, so you can pick and choose and miss them.

Mr. Ryan: I think the issue we're looking at here, is if we give exceptions to certain lots for building, we're going to end up down into a building envelope. We would need to see that not only the building envelope has the ability to be graded correctly with consideration of runwater and proposed well location. For instance, on Lot 11.

Mr. Greer: One of the conditions was to combine 2 lots. (Showed brackets on the map.) That's why we did this. What you see in orange are slopes that are 20% or more. On Lot 10, there's a little piece that is over 20%, he anticipates the driveway would probably be in one of two locations that isn't in that area.

Mr. Ryan: It looks like you're putting the driveway across the grade. If you put a driveway in at that point, don't you think that's going to affect runoff?

Mr. Greer: Pointed out a culvert where the water would go. The 20% slopes provide an opportunity to have a daylight basement on one side and a flat area on the other side.

Mr. Ryan: What kind of footprint for a house?

Mr. Greer: 50 X 50. If you take a look at houses that's built in a wooded area, they typically end up in a 75 foot square opening. Sometimes you'll see a little bit bigger than that if they have a large garage or a bigger septic system, but that's about the size for people that don't want lots of yard.

Mr. Espinosa: Based on this map, Lots 1, Lot 11, Lot 13, we've got the steeper angles.

Mr. Ryan: What was the building plan for Lot 13? It looks like it's been developed, but what is the grading plan there?

Ms. Lane: Does the slope on 13 show on the other map?

Mr. Bower: Lot 13 is out of the picture. It has nothing to do with this. However, Lot 11 is the big issue. What if you had him define a building envelope that was outside of those steeper areas?

Mr. Ryan: It seems that you don't want to combine them?

Mr. Greer: That's correct. We don't want to combine them.

Mr. Ryan: That would be significantly more restrictive to a potential buyer.

Mr. Greer: That may be, but the question here is, when we get to the road, we're going to put in significant money into the road, and the number of lots that we have directly impacts the overall financial piece of that.

Mr. Espinosa: We're kind of jumping ahead of what you want to talk about. So we agree that Lot 1, Lot 11 and Lot 4, you'll do grading plans on them?

Mr. Greer: We don't have any problems with that. We'll show grading plans and driveways. We want to work with the board, but by taking away a lot, that leaves us less money to do the improvements to the road.

Ms. Lane: Can I ask what you're selecting them for? I'm just wondering why certain ones are being talked about.

Mr. Espinosa: They have the biggest envelope of 20% grade in the potential building areas.

Ms. Lane: So the other lots are of no concern?

Mr. Espinosa: No, these are the ones with the highest concern.

(Lots of garbled noises here)

Traffic Impact Study

Mr. Sullivan: We've provided you with traffic data in the application. He asked the board to be more specific about what they want.

Mr. Sullivan: Would like to get an idea of how the road would be upgraded.

Chairman Nance: With 12-13 lots, that's going to increase the traffic

Mr. Ryan: I think there's going to be more traffic than you imagine. People are working out of their homes.

Mr. Sullivan: Typically that generates slightly less than 10 trips per day.

Mr. Ryan: So that's another 130 trips. We want to see a more in depth study – a better look at this.

Mr. Greer: We would rather spend our money upgrading the road, rather than on a traffic study that would not tell you a whole lot.

Mr. Ryan: I think there is more to look at. We never really shook down why we saw the speed limit decrease.

Speed Limit

Jesse Stacey: Discussion about an individual who changed the speed limits because he felt the traffic was going too fast. He spoke to the sheriff and a new sign was put up which legally he cannot do, but he didn't know that. It had nothing to do with this. It was not done by the proper procedure. Someone from the state has to come out and look at our town to address the limit. The guy is coming out and he's going to do 4 or 5 roads. Someone from the state does a study. It may be 25 when he's done, nobody knows.

Mr. Ryan: the site distances are based on 45 mph.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you saying that the site distances for 9 driveways along Hussey Road are based on a 45 mph? I don't think that's going to work if you have 9 drivers along Hussey Road at 45 mph. This is the complaint.

Mr. Espinosa: If the speed limit decreases, that means they can have shorter sight distances

Mr. Greer: Don't want you to be surprised, but there are some big trees that are along the line which might come down.

Mr. Sullivan: All the residents along Hussey Road have signed a letter requesting that the dirt portions be paved, since the increased traffic will produce significant washboarding.

Mr. Greer: That's beyond our project. They are planning to widen the paved sections, but not pave the dirt. We'll consider it, but are reluctant. Costs here are significant.

Mr. Ryan: If you want to work with us, you're going to have to work with things like that. Things that are slightly out of the envelope.

Mr. Espinosa: Every resident on that road is impacted by this. Two months ago we discussed the community being so opposed to this project. There is a list of residents saying this is the most bothersome thing, it might be a consideration.

Mr. Sullivan: I know you're concerned about the expense, but I think the community in general would agree that if you reduced the number of lots, you wouldn't make as much, but it wouldn't cost you as much. In the end, that would be 10 additional driveways off of Hussey Road.

Ms. Brendt: with regards to the speed limit, this has nothing to do with Watson Woods development. The ditching was planned before.

Mr. Sullivan: The perception here is that the winds of fortune blow in the direction of Nate Wadsworth in ways that they wouldn't for other people.

Ms. Brendt: On the record, as a citizen, I'm against this project

Unidentified Man: Lived there for 18 years with speed limit at 45 and nobody did a darn thing. He has a hard time dealing with coincidences.

Deed restrictions and Green Space

Mr. Greer: Additional buffers on the backs of Lots 2 and 5 and we will include them in the deed.

More than 50% would be

The each individual lot owner.

Deed restriction on Lot 10 regarding vernal pool – We've added that last time and taken the building envelope out of that area so we have the 100 foot setback. No cut buffer.

Mr. Clifford: Reminded the board about no earth moving within the 50 buffer.

Merging Lots 11 and 12

Widening Hussey Road

Value of the Homes: We have no control over that

Lot 1: Would probably use a combined driveway with Lot 2.

Asked for covenants

Well exclusion zones. Will add the language.

Mr. Ryan: Keep the subdivision plan on one sheet, and then provide more detailed information on each individual lot on a larger scale.

Mr. Clifford: the sketch plan is off and this is a waste of the board's time.

Mr. Espinosa: What we're asking is to clarify what they'd like to see.

Mr. Clifford: biological assessment. Forest society to do an impact study on wildlife. Where's the septic?

Mr. Espinosa: Their preliminary application is incomplete. That's why we're asking these questions.

Chairman Nance: I didn't have to let you speak, but I gave you the courtesy. Please no other outbursts or I will ask you to leave.

Mr. Ryan: What we need is project what this type of traffic on a dirt road. We need to understand what the cost of what this project will have on the town. Infrastructure impact study or infrastructure analysis.

Corey Lane: Clarification on 2 items – High intensity soil survey – sees a medium survey and the difference is quite grand. The other issue is storm water management plan – hasn't seen it. The site needs to be looked at as a whole and the fact that it hasn't been submitted.

Put a letter together putting the difference between the two.

Mr. Greer: Asked for a letter clarifying the requests.

Informational Hearing on Tuesday, January 16 at 6:00

Mr. Espinosa reviewed how to run the January 16 meeting. He would like to provide an example of what is going to be voted on. He hopes to present a simply stated and clearly mapped out example for the meeting. The text will be taken from the State definitions, and the maps will be broken down into zones. The documents will be available online. Documents have to be available by January 5. Everything needs to be ready for the December meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Approved

Date